



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,035	12/30/2003	Louis A. Lippincott	42P16959	9217

7590 05/29/2008
John P. Ward
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

MEROUAN, ABDERRAHIM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2628

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/29/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/750,035	Applicant(s) LIPPINCOTT, LOUIS A.	
	Examiner ABDERRAHIM MEROUAN	Art Unit 2628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12/30/2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. Following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Fang (U.S. PGPUB 20040257369 A1) hereinafter referred as Fang.

As per claim 1 Fang teaches:

A system, comprising:

a processor; (Fang, Fig 3, Block 300)

a memory controller hub coupled to the processor; (Fang, Fig 3, Block 320)

a plurality of graphics frame buffers (Fang , column 2, lines 1 to 4 and column 3, line 1) coupled to the memory controller hub; (Fang, Fig 3, Block 130)

a plurality of video frame buffers(Fang , column 2, lines 1 to 4 and column 3, lines 1), the video frame buffer to receive input from a plurality of tuners; (Fang, Figure 3, Block 200," the figure 3 shows a plurality of analog video decoders that receive analog video input in Figure 4 block 400. This step happened through a plurality of tuners")

a blending and display unit to receive input from the plurality of video frame buffers and the memory controller hub; and (Fang, Figure 2, Block 230 and Figure 3 Block 320)

a plurality of video output units coupled to the blending and display unit. (Fang, Figure 2, Block 180)

3. As per claim 10, Fan teaches: A method, comprising:

associating each of a plurality of graphics frame buffers(Fang, Page 3, Paragraph [0020] , lines 6 to 9) with a corresponding one of a plurality of players, (Fang, Page 3, Paragraph [0021] , lines 1 to 3)

storing images for the viewing perspective of each player in the associated graphics frame buffers; (Fang, Page 2, Paragraph [0018] , lines 13 to 16) and

outputting the images associated with each player to a separate display. (Fang, Page 1, Paragraph [0006], lines 17 to 20)

4. As per 11, Fan teaches: The method of claim 10, claim 11 adds to claim 10:

further comprising blending graphics frames with video frames before outputting the images. (Fang, Page 1, Paragraph [0007], lines 1 to 3)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2 – 6 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fang (U.S. PG PUB 20040257369 A1) hereinafter referred as Fang., in view of Grapes I (U.S. Patent 6446130 B1) hereinafter referred as Grapes.

As per claim 2 Fang teaches: The system of claim 1.

Fang doesn't teach: the plurality of tuners to receive input from an RF cable.

Grapes teaches: the plurality of tuners to receive input from an RF cable (Grapes, Column 3, lines 33 to 39).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that using an RF cable as taught by Grapes into the process of the Fan to provide an efficient transmission.

6. As per claim 3, Grapes teaches: The system of claim 2, claim 3 adds to claim 2: the plurality of video output units (Grapes, Figure 2, block 23) to each include an RF modulator. (Grapes, Figure 2, block 30)

7. As per claim 4. Grapes teaches: The system of claim 3, claim 4 adds to claim 3: each of the plurality of video output units to output a video display signal onto the RF cable. (Grapes, Column 16, lines 3 to 5).

8. As per claim 5. Grapes teaches: The system of claim 4, claim 5 adds to claim 4 wherein each of the plurality of video output units outputs a video display signal onto separate channels on the RF cable. (Grapes, column 6, lines 32 to 38)

9. As per claim 6. Grapes teaches: The system of claim 5, claim 6 adds to claim 5.

wherein the RF cable is coupled to a plurality of televisions. (Grapes, column 3, lines 20 to 28)

10. Argument used to reject claim 12 are the same as the arguments used to reject claim 2

11. As per claim 13, Fan teaches: The method of claim 12, claim 13 adds to claim 12:

wherein outputting the images associated with each player to a separate display includes outputting the images to a plurality of televisions. (Fan, Page 1, Paragraph[0003], lines 8 to 12)

12. As per claim 14, Fan teaches: The method of claim 13, claim 14 adds to claim 13:

further comprising receiving game controller input (Fan, Page 2, Paragraph [0018], lines 1 to 2), the game controller input causing modification of the viewing perspective(Fan, Page 2, Paragraph [0018], line 17) of at least one of the plurality of players. (Fan, Page 2, Paragraph [0018], lines 2 to 3)

13. Argument used to reject claim 15 are the same as the arguments used to reject claim 9

14. Argument used to reject claim 16 are the same as the arguments used to reject claim 8

15. Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fang (U.S PG PUB 20040257369 A1) hereinafter referred as Fang., in view of Grapes (U.S Patent 6446130 B1) hereinafter referred as Grapes, and further in view of Elliott (US PG PUB 20020077177 A1) hereinafter referred as Elliott.

16. As per claim 7, Fan in view of Grapes teaches: The system of claim 6.

Fan in view of Grapes doesn't teach:

further comprising a plurality of game controllers couple to an input/output hub controller, the input/output hub controller coupled to the graphics/memory controller hub.

Elliott teaches:

further comprising a plurality of game controllers(Elliott, Page 4, Paragraph [0056], lines 1 to 2) couple to an input/output hub controller (Elliott, Page 9, Paragraph [0101], lines 1 to 8), the input/output hub controller coupled to the graphics/memory controller hub. (Elliott, Page 5, Paragraph [0071], lines 1 to 15)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that connecting the game controllers to the graphics/memory controller hub as taught by Elliott into the process of the Fan in view of Grapes to provide an easy use of the game by the user.

17. As per claim 8 Elliott teaches: The system of claim 7. Claim 8 ads to claim 7: wherein at least one of the plurality of game controllers is coupled (Elliott, Paragraph [0056], lines 1 to 2)to the input/output controller hub(Elliott, Page 9, Paragraph [0101], lines 1 to 8) via the RF cable(Elliott, Page 3, Paragraph [0049], lines 1 to 4)

18. As per claim 9 Elliott teaches: The system of claim 7. Claim 9 ads to claim 7: wherein at least one the plurality of game controllers is coupled (Elliott, Paragraph [0056], lines 1 to 2) to the input/output controller hub (Elliott, Page 9,

Paragraph [0101], lines 1 to 8) via a wireless connection. (Elliott, Page 4, Paragraph [0056], lines 9 to 12)

Conclusion

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ABDERRAHIM MEROUAN whose telephone number is (571)270-5254. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xiao Wu can be reached on (571) 272-7761. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Abderrahim Merouan
Patent Examiner

Application/Control Number: 10/750,035

Page 8

Art Unit: 2628

Art Unit 2628

/XIAO M. WU/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2628